

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
Alexandria Division**

MARGARET BERRETT,

v.

**ANDREW M. SAUL,
Acting Commissioner of Social
Security,
Defendant.**

Case No. 1:19cv00801

ORDER

On July 23, 2020, United States Magistrate Judge Ivan D. Davis entered a Report and Recommendation (“Report”) in this social security case regarding a final decision from the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration denying plaintiff’s claim for disability insurance benefits. In the Report, Judge Davis recommends that plaintiff’s motion for summary judgment be denied and that defendant’s motion for summary judgment be granted.¹ Specifically, the Report holds: (i) that the Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) sufficiently explained how he determined plaintiff’s residual functional capacity (“RFC”) as to routine, tasks, production quotas, and concentration, attention, and pace; (ii) that the ALJ explained how he determined plaintiff’s functional limitations as of March 24, 2015; and (iii) that the ALJ did not fail to address material evidence from two medical exams.

¹ Both parties in this matter were represented by counsel.

Upon consideration of the record and Judge Davis's thorough and well-reasoned Report, to which no objections have been filed, and having found no clear error,²

The Court **ADOPTS**, as its own, the findings and facts and recommendations of Judge Davis as set forth in his Report (Doc. 19).

Accordingly,

It is hereby **ORDERED** that plaintiff's motion for summary judgment (Doc. 10) is **DENIED**.

It is further **ORDERED** that defendant's motion for summary judgment (Doc. 16) is **GRANTED**.

The Clerk of Court is directed to enter Rule 58 judgment in favor of the defendant.

The Clerk of the Court is further directed to provide a copy of this Order to all counsel of record and to place this matter among the ended causes.

Alexandria, Virginia
August 10, 2020



T. S. Ellis, III
United States District Judge

² See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (in the absence of any objections to a magistrate's report, the court "need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'").